

### REMARKS

Claims 1-8 were objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the claims appropriately.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 as being obvious over Matsumoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,334).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Matsumoto discloses a system and method for determining which ads direct which web clicks comprising (abstract):

a database comprising information about a user's media buys (fig. 1, item 15, col. 7, lines 15-56);

an index log file optionally comprising a user's IP address (fig. 2, item 62, col. 8, lines 53-64);

said system comparing information from said database with information from said index log file to determine which of said ads generated said web clicks (col. 10, lines 8-12).

Matsumoto does not expressly teach a second database for storing user's IP address, but does store user's referrer log showing all referring pages from which the user is led to entrance page and also optionally stores the user's IP address in the index log file (62). Note, the user's IP address does not have to be stored because Matsumoto system uses an index URL embedded in the ad which allows for the monitoring of the user's accesses induced by the advertisement hence the actions of the user are known without the need for user's IP address , however, optionally user's IP address may be stored (col. 8, lines 53-63).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store user's IP address and referrer log in a second database in the Matsumoto system by simply modifying the index log file (62) to be implemented as a database. One would be motivated to use a second database instead of an index log file to easier manipulated the data stored in the index log file.

Claim 1 requires a second database comprising a user's IP addresses. Claim 1 further requires that the system compare information from the first database with information from the second database to determine which of the advertisements generated the web clicks.

Matsumoto does not teach or make obvious a second database comprising a user's IP address. Further Matsumoto does not teach or make obvious that the system compare information from the first database with information from the second database to determine which of the advertisements generated the web clicks.

Matsumoto creates a unique URL for every advertisement which a user can then tell from which advertisement they were directed to the web site. The problem with this is that in order to determine which advertisement directed the web click, an advertiser would have to create hundreds or thousands of web sites which would cost the advertiser hundreds of thousands of dollars. Matsumoto does not use the IP address compared to the information about the media buy to determine what advertisement drove the user to the website.

Claim 7 requires inputting information about a user's IP addresses into a second database and comparing information from the first database with information from the

second database. As stated above, Matsumoto does not teach or make obvious inputting a user's IP address into a second database. Further, Matsumoto does not compare information about a user's media buy with a user's IP address. Therefore claim 7 is not obvious over Matsumoto.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Matsumoto discloses the system further comprises a report which shows which ads generated the web clicks (col. 9, lines 61-65).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1 and 7, claims 2 and 8 are not obvious over Matsumoto.

Regarding claim 3, Matsumoto discloses information about the user's buys comprises;

data and time of advertising, type of advertising, location of ad and expiration data of the ad (col. 7, lines 24-40).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 3 is not obvious over Matsumoto.

Regarding claim 4, Matsumoto discloses the information about a user's media buys further comprises cost of the ad (col. 5, lines 22-29).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 4 is not obvious over Matsumoto.

Regarding claim 5, Matsumoto discloses the information about a user's media buys further comprises demographics of the ad (col. 6, lines 59-63).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 5 is not obvious over Matsumoto.

Regarding claim 6, Matsumoto discloses a report which shows which of the web clicks do not correspond to an ad (col. 9, line 61 to col. 10, line 7).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 6 is not obvious over Matsumoto.

Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EV 581903850 US

Date of Deposit: January 13, 2005

I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith  
Is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail

Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the  
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner  
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on  
January 13, 2005

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss

Reg. No. 34,751

Attorney for Applicant

Weiss & Weiss

300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251

Mineola, NY 11501

(516) 739-1500

PMW:db